

the committee, we had over 800 amendments that were part of the bill to start with.

One of the reasons—and I think I speak for Senator REED and myself at the same time. We have had some experiences in the past where, since the Senate operates with unanimous consent, we were unable to have any amendments at all on the floor. So in order to do that, to make sure—if that should happen again, we wanted to make sure we had all these amendments already in the bill. So that was our starting point.

Now, here is where we are today. We had a great vote on the NDAA, receiving an 87-to-13 vote in favor of ending debate on the substitute. That was great. That was today. That means we are at kind of the end of this process now. We have continued to work on another managers' package.

Last night we hotlined—a lot of the people who may be watching are not familiar with the terminology. We hotlined—we sent out to all the Democrats and all the Republicans for any objections they might have—another group of amendments. It was a large group, an equal number of amendments for Democrats and Republicans. It came back, and there were a lot of objections to it, so we have now taken that and started on one last managers' package that we are going to be—a modified version that we are going to hotline tonight.

It is very important that people are listening right now. A lot of times people aren't listening. Certainly, the staffs should let their Members know that they are going to get a hotline on actually 40 amendments—20 Democratic amendments, 20 Republican amendments—tonight. That is going to be the hotline they are going to look at. Some of your staff and some of the Members may not have read these amendments yet. It is likely that is the case. If you have objections to amendments in this package—that is what we are hotlining—we encourage you to lodge those objections with the Cloakroom. That is when you get these things. That is going to be tonight. We will note those objections and see what remains.

Tomorrow morning—let's say all the objections have come in. Tomorrow morning, at a time—we were hoping that time was going to be around 10:30 tomorrow, but we know a lot of people want to talk; a lot of people want to be heard. We can't control that, but we will ask for unanimous consent to pass the package with a balanced number of amendments from both Democrats and Republicans. This is tomorrow, hopefully at 10:30, but maybe that will not work.

We will require Members who want to object to this final package to come down to the floor in person and object. If you already have an objection to a specific amendment in this package registered with the Cloakroom, the amendment should have been pulled

from the package. It will not even appear at that time. Otherwise, you need to be here to object in person.

We use the term "balanced." This is how this works. We have 40 amendments that are going to be hotlined tonight. If the Republicans have eight of them that they object to and the Democrats have seven they object to, they have to find one more to object to so it ends up being eight and eight or so that the number will be equal. It sounds a little complicated and it sounds like something that might not work, but it will work. We have been doing this now for over a year. Actually, we started this process 2 years ago. So it is going to be the responsibility of the Democrats and the Republicans to make that even so that no one can say that it is biased to one side.

So all of that is what is going to happen, and it is very important that staff and Members be aware of that because what we don't want to happen is to have someone come along and say they were not aware of this process that is in place. So that is the process we are going to use, and that is one that is fair.

Again, I don't think—and this will be the 60th consecutive year. There has never been a year, in my memory, that has had more amendments considered than we have considered this year.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

#### REINFORCING AMERICAN-MADE PRODUCTS ACT OF 2020

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, when Americans see a "Made in the U.S.A." label on a product, it is a source of great pride, and justifiably so. It represents the American virtues of entrepreneurialism and industriousness. It also alludes to the fact that, as Americans, we have a common sense of destiny and a common appreciation for the inherent dignity and eternal worth of the human soul. It is a symbol of support for American manufacturing jobs, for local communities, and for high-quality products. So it often spurs American consumers as well as foreign consumers to buy a particular product—a product lucky enough to have that label.

The Federal Trade Commission currently enforces a difficult standard for all products that want to claim the "Made in the U.S.A." label. It requires that "all or virtually all" of a product be made in the United States, and it has issued a lengthy legal guidance document—or a series thereof—establishing rules for who may and may not claim that title.

However, one State holds a different standard—one that is nearly impossible for businesses to meet. Under California's law, if more than 5 percent of the components of a particular product are manufactured outside the United States—even if that means just a few

bolts or a few screws—that product cannot lawfully be labeled "Made in the U.S.A."

Because of the flow of interstate and international commerce, in which most manufacturers sell wholesale to national and international distributors who then disperse products all throughout the country, the other 49 States are forced to comply with this one—the most rigid definition—in order to avoid costly litigation.

For many practical purposes, this just means they can't use the label. It makes it impracticable as a business matter and not feasible as a legal matter for them to claim that label. Even though they could legally boast the "Made in the U.S.A." claim in every other State in the country, California makes it more or less impossible for them to do so. In other words, a single State is effectively dictating a country-of-origin label. Think about that for a minute.

If California or any other State in the Union, for that matter, would like to create a State-of-origin label, I have no issue with such a State doing that and wouldn't suggest that the Federal Government ought to undo those parameters. But as it currently stands, the California law undermines Congress's rightful authority to regulate interstate commerce and needlessly hurts American manufacturers.

This is one of the reasons we are our own country. This is one of the reasons we fly the Stars and Stripes. It is one of the reasons the Constitution came into existence to begin with—to give Congress the power to regulate commerce between the several States with foreign nations and with Indians Tribes. Our previous form of government, under the Articles of Confederation, didn't create a Congress that had that power. As a result, in the early days following the American Revolution, States were engaging in activities amounting to economic Balkanization. We saw economic Balkanization among and between the States. That is why our Founding Fathers gathered in that hot, fateful, and sweltering summer of 1787 in Philadelphia—for this very reason.

The Reinforcing American-Made Products Act would solve this very problem. It would simply ensure that the FTC has the exclusive authority to set the national standard for "Made in the U.S.A." labeling. The legislation would provide clarity and consistency, helping American companies to avoid unnecessary hardships and frivolous lawsuits that would otherwise deter them from using this coveted and justifiably enviable label of "Made in the U.S.A."

Now more than ever, in the midst of the economic turmoil associated with the global pandemic, we ought to be doing all we can to support American jobs and to strengthen our local communities. This legislation would help us accomplish just that. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of S. 4065 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4065) to make exclusive the authority of the Federal Government to regulate the labeling of products made in the United States and introduced in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. LEE. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 4065) was passed, as follows:

S. 4065

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Reinforcing American-Made Products Act of 2020”.

#### SEC. 2. EXCLUSIVITY OF FEDERAL AUTHORITY TO REGULATE LABELING OF PRODUCTS MADE IN THE UNITED STATES AND INTRODUCED IN INTERSTATE OR FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Section 320933 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (15 U.S.C. 45a) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “To the extent” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—To the extent”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) EFFECT ON STATE LAW.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the provisions of this section shall supersede any provisions of the law of any State expressly relating to the extent to which a product is introduced, delivered for introduction, sold, advertised, or offered for sale in interstate or foreign commerce with a ‘Made in the U.S.A.’ or ‘Made in America’ label, or the equivalent thereof, in order to represent that such product was in whole or substantial part of domestic origin.

“(2) ENFORCEMENT.—Nothing in this section shall preclude the application of the law of any State to the use of a label not in compliance with subsection (a).”; and

(3) in the third sentence of subsection (a), as so designated by paragraph (1), by striking “Nothing in this section” and inserting “Except as provided in subsection (b), nothing in this section”.

Mr. LEE. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

#### DRIFTNET MODERNIZATION AND BYCATCH REDUCTION ACT

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 316, S. 906.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 906) to improve the management of driftnet fishing.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment as follows: (The part of the bill to be inserted is shown in *italic*.)

S. 906

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act”.

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITION.

Section 3(25) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1802(25)) is amended by inserting “, or with a mesh size of 14 inches or greater,” after “more”.

#### SEC. 3. FINDINGS AND POLICY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Section 206(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1826(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) within the exclusive economic zone, large-scale driftnet fishing that deploys nets with large mesh sizes causes significant entanglement and mortality of living marine resources, including myriad protected species, despite limitations on the lengths of such nets.”.

(b) POLICY.—Section 206(c) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1826(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following—

“(4) prioritize the phase out of large-scale driftnet fishing in the exclusive economic zone and promote the development and adoption of alternative fishing methods and gear types that minimize the incidental catch of living marine resources.”.

#### SEC. 4. TRANSITION PROGRAM.

Section 206 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1826) is amended by adding at the end the following—

“(1) FISHING GEAR TRANSITION PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—During the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act, the Secretary shall conduct a transition program to facilitate the phase-out of large-scale driftnet fishing and adoption of alternative fishing practices that minimize the incidental catch of living marine resources, and shall award grants to eligible permit holders who participate in the program.

“(2) PERMISSIBLE USES.—Any permit holder receiving a grant under paragraph (1) may use such funds only for the purpose of covering—

“(A) any fee originally associated with a permit authorizing participation in a large-

scale driftnet fishery, if such permit is surrendered for permanent revocation, and such permit holder relinquishes any claim associated with the permit;

“(B) a forfeiture of fishing gear associated with a permit described in subparagraph (A); or

“(C) the purchase of alternative gear with minimal incidental catch of living marine resources, if the fishery participant is authorized to continue fishing using such alternative gears.

“(3) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall certify that, with respect to each participant in the program under this subsection, any permit authorizing participation in a large-scale driftnet fishery has been permanently revoked and that no new permits will be issued to authorize such fishing.”.

#### SEC. 5. EXCEPTION.

Section 307(1)(M) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1857(1)(M)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: “, unless such large-scale driftnet fishing—

“(i) deploys, within the exclusive economic zone, a net with a total length of less than two and one-half kilometers and a mesh size of 14 inches or greater; and

“(ii) is conducted within 5 years of the date of enactment of the Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act”.

#### SEC. 6. FEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The North Pacific Fishery Management Council may recommend, and the Secretary of Commerce may approve, regulations necessary for the collection of fees from charter vessel operators who guide recreational anglers who harvest Pacific halibut in International Pacific Halibut Commission regulatory areas 2C and 3A as those terms are defined in part 300 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

(b) USE OF FEES.—Any fees collected under this section shall be available, without appropriation or fiscal year limitation, for the purposes of—

(1) financing administrative costs of the Recreational Quota Entity program;

(2) the purchase of halibut quota shares in International Pacific Halibut Commission regulatory areas 2C and 3A by the recreational quota entity authorized in part 679 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations);

(3) halibut conservation and research; and

(4) promotion of the halibut resource by the recreational quota entity authorized in part 679 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

Mr. KAINE. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. KAINE. I know of no further debate on the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 906), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 906

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*